

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
9  
10 Plaintiff,

No. CR 08-0730 WHA

11 v.

**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT  
DEFENDANT URIAS'S MOTION TO  
SUPPRESS EVIDENCE**

12 MAURICIO URIAS and JUDITH  
13 SOSA  
14 Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_ /


15 In light of defendant Mauricio Urias's guilty plea in this matter, his motion to suppress  
16 evidence seized during the search of his residence is **DENIED AS MOOT**. A previous order held  
17 that defendant Urias had made a substantial showing that the affidavit in support of the search  
18 warrant of his residence misrepresented a telephone conversation between defendant Urias and  
19 confidential informant CS-2. CS-2 was scheduled to testify regarding this telephone  
20 conversation at a *Franks* hearing on February 2, 2010. That hearing is **VACATED AS MOOT**.

21 Co-defendant Judith Sosa filed a notice of joinder with defendant Urias's motion to  
22 suppress. Although defendant Sosa stated that she "adopts the arguments" made in defendant  
23 Urias's motion, she did not explain how a motion to suppress the evidence resulting from the  
24 search of Urias's residence pertained to her. A previous order found that the search of her own  
25 residence was made pursuant to her consent and later pursuant to a different search warrant.  
26  
27  
28

1 Defendant Sosa was also not a participant in the telephone call between defendant Urias and  
2 CS-2 at issue in defendant Urias's motion. For these reasons, her motion for joinder is **DENIED**.

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: January 28, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE